

CHRISTIANITY and CRISIS

DETROIT PUBLIC LIBRARY

OCT 23 1961

PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION
& EDUCATION

A Christian Journal of Opinion

The UN and Our Many-Sided Crisis

The loss of Dag Hammarskjöld has had a remarkably unifying effect upon humanity, except for those in the Eastern camp who, for artificial reasons, were opposed to him. His single-minded and selfless devotion to the cause of the United Nations is admired on all sides, as is his embodiment of what Walter Lippmann calls "the European tradition of civility." Even at a time when moral relativism concerning general principles is prevalent, there is considerable agreement in regard to the kind of person who arouses the moral admiration of men of many conditions and cultures.

The dismay that is felt throughout the world comes in part from the curious combination of circumstances that make Mr. Hammarskjöld so difficult to replace. So long as he was alive, the struggle over the *troika* principle could have been postponed for another two years, but now the struggle is on. Also, the need for a strong executive for the UN has never been greater than will be the case if there is a chance to combine some accommodations on the Berlin issue with UN presence in that city. In recent weeks it has seemed that there has been greater willingness on both sides to consider an important role for the UN in Berlin along lines suggested by Canadian Prime Minister Diefenbaker.

The dispute over the office of the Secretary General has revealed a fortunate concurrence of views among the US, its allies and most of the uncommitted nations. It is good that this concurrence has been so clearly revealed at a time when so many Americans are tempted to write off the uncommitted nations as little more than indicators of the strength of the winds that blow from Moscow. Actually, the nations at the Belgrade meeting

refused to go along with the *troika* principle because they knew that they needed a strong UN for their own expression and protection.

The difficulty of discovering leadership in the UN illustrates the value of having some nations and statesmen on whom both sides can agree. If the world were divided into two solid blocks with no one in between, there would be no hope of preserving the UN. The role of a Nehru in preserving the freedom of India and in helping to develop for his country a viable alternative to communism is of crucial importance. The wholesale tirades against the nonaligned nations by such liberals as Max Ascoli and Eric Severeid are most unfortunate.

The many-sided crisis that the UN now faces—the choice of a Secretary General, the Congo, Berlin, admission of Red China, etc.—will call for much patience and understanding in this country. The Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations have both emphasized loyalty to the UN, but the pressures for withdrawal will be vastly increased if we are outvoted on the China issue. There is a great reservoir of support for the UN in the churches, and this support will need to be reasserted in the context of current criticism from the extreme Right.

As has been the case since its foundation, the UN has been hindered in quite different ways both by the actions of those who regard it as a foreign body that is inimicable to US interests and by the excessive expectations of those who regard it as a panacea, for such expectations lead to disillusionment. The important thing now is to see the value of what the United Nations has done

Vol. XX, No. 17, October 16, 1961 \$5.00 per year; 25 cents a copy

and can do even under the conditions of the cold war—as an instrument of perpetual diplomacy, as a forum that gives all member nations a chance to be heard, as an organization that can develop considerable moral force, as a bridge, however precarious, between the two worlds, as a structure that gives great opportunities for influence to the most responsible small and “middle powers” such as Canada, Tunisia, Ireland, and India (which, because it represents so large a part of humanity and yet lacks military and economic power, is in a class by itself), as a friendly guide for the new nations, as a center of many activities for social welfare and economic development.

The UN is also ready to receive “the new strength and new roles” of which President Kennedy spoke in his wise and forceful address to the General Assembly. Of course, this will depend not on the UN itself but on agreement between the powers.

The President is right when he says: “In the development of this organization rests the only true alternative to war.”

J. C. B.

THE I.C.C. AND INTEGRATION

THE UNANIMOUS RULING of the Interstate Commerce Commission, handed down on September 22, is cause for great encouragement on the part of those concerned about racial desegregation. It has been clear for some time that segregation in bus terminal waiting rooms, rest rooms, lunch counters and restaurants is illegal. It has been equally clear, as the Freedom Rides have shown, that local officials have not only failed to comply with the Federal law but have arrested those who to assert their constitutional right to use interstate bus facilities in desegregated fashion.

The ICC ruling not only clarifies where responsibility for compliance will now lie, by prohibiting interstate busses from stopping at segregated terminals, but also precludes in advance many of the diversionary and delaying tactics that might otherwise result, by emphasizing that the ruling holds whether the bus company operates the facilities or not. Furthermore, the order to display signs pointing out that use of all facilities “is without regard to race, color, creed or national origin, by order of the Interstate Commerce Commission” will give the harassed Negro passenger an immediate authority to which he can point if he is denied service or threatened by local officials. The imposition of a stiff series of fines will implement these and other regulations contained in the order.

All of this, while cause for rejoicing, does not mean that the battle for integration has been won or is nearly won. It means simply that one tiny segment of the entire struggle, the desegregation of interstate bus facilities, has received encouraging and far-reaching support. But the battle on this and all the other fronts will have to continue with relentless pressure if we are to create a nation that does not continue to have two brands of citizenship—the regular brand for most of us, and the inferior brand for those who happen to have darker skin.

We salute the Attorney General for requesting this ruling and hope that he and others involved in law enforcement will be equally forthright as other dimensions of the struggle for integration come to require similarly vigorous action.

R. M. B.

THE NEW ERA IN ECONOMIC HISTORY

IT IS GOOD that the National Council of Churches has issued a “call” to a study conference on “Ethical Issues of Rapid Economic Change in the U.S.A.”

Since the days of the Great Depression, when Christian concern for society focused largely on the economic problem, other issues have come to the fore. First, the Nazi menace and the Christian attitude toward war became dominant questions. More recently the most urgent problems have been racial relations and international policies in a nuclear age.

The economy, however, is always fundamental to society. When prosperity makes people relatively complacent, the Church has increased responsibility to ask about the effects on persons of our economic processes.

Americans are now living through one of the spectacular economic changes of all history. Throughout the centuries scarcity has presented the ethical problem of producing and distributing economic goods with maximum justice and minimum suffering. Slavery, starvation, frightful working conditions and survival on a subsistence basis have marked the past—and still characterize the present in much of the world.

Now a new age has arrived—in fact or in promise. The US can produce enough to provide everyone an adequate standard of living. The fact that some have no share in prosperity—notably racial groups, migrant workers and families in impoverished areas—is due more to our whole cultural organization than to insufficient production.

Outside North America and Europe a majority

of mankind still suffers from desperate poverty. Their plight will not be easily changed. But if the human race can meet the problems of war and population explosion, the means are available to heighten production everywhere. History offers the human race an unprecedented future.

The new promises do not guarantee that the economy will serve human welfare. The nature of the shifting ethical issues in our national economy appears in the record of the conferences sponsored by the National Council of Churches and its Department of the Church and Economic Life.

The first such conference in 1947 had the very general topic, "The Church and Economic life." Veterans of the meetings recall that one-third of the time was spent in arguing whether the Church had any responsibility in this area. Such arguments still arise in America. But leaders of industry, labor, agriculture, consumers and government gladly participate in the conferences, acknowledging that the Church has a concern.

The second conference in 1950 discussed "Christian Responsibility in an Interdependent Economy." The clash of groups—capital, labor, agriculture and government—marked the meetings, with special attention to the role of government.

The old issues are still with us, but the conference of 1956 marked the entry into the new era. Its subject was "The Christian Conscience and an Economy of Abundance." It faced a new set of questions, subtler than those of the past but just as important. What happens to persons when an

economy produces so luxuriantly that it must incite people to consume far more than they need? The timeliness of the subject became evident as the public in following years entered into long discussions of problems of affluence.

The next stage in the new era appears in preparations for the conference of November 1962. The wording of the topic, with its reference to "rapid economic change," curiously reproduces the phraseology that the World Council of Churches has used for areas just entering into the technological revolution. This coincidence is a healthy reminder that the US and its problems are part of a world with comparable problems.

Rapid change is a trait of all industrial economies. Several contemporary facts accelerate it: world revolution, national defense policies, scientific developments and, above all, automation. From all sides we hear promises of the long-range benefits of automation. High productivity, relief from drudgery, expansion of leisure outrun the wildest expectations of traditional utopias. But no future entirely cancels the sudden loss of jobs, the ghost towns and the radical dislocations of families in the present. A society that is too ready to worship high production must now take account of some of the human costs.

We salute Charles Taft, Chairman of the Department of the Church and Economic Life, and Cameron Hall, its Executive Director, for their alertness in calling the attention of the churches to the ethical issues in this new economic era.

R. L. S.

A Challenge to the Church in the Affluent West

Communism in Areas of Rapid Social Change*

PAUL R. ABRECHT

IN THE AREAS of rapid social change several movements and ideologies are vying for leadership of the revolutionary political and social movements, and the churches must fight on many different fronts to preserve the integrity of social change that truly seeks the welfare of man. In all these countries communism is working actively and aggressively to take control of the social revolution, and the churches have discovered, often only belatedly, that even their own members, and particularly their youth, are attracted by the power of communism to give direction in a changing society. Indeed their members are often particularly suscep-

tible to the appeal of communism because of its emphasis on social justice and its concern for the needs of the poorest groups in society.

The churches have frequently discovered that they are not prepared to meet the challenge of communism. Christian leaders in some of the new nations of Africa have even stated that they fear the coming of independence because it will mean increased Communist propaganda, especially among

*This article is adapted from Mr. Abrecht's book, *The Churches and Rapid Social Change*, which will be published by Doubleday on December 1. It is one part of the report of a study made by the World Council of Churches Division of Studies. The other part of the study, *Man in Rapid Social Change* by Egbert de Vries, will be published simultaneously. ©1961 by the World Council of Churches (Division of Studies).

MR. ABRECHT is Executive Secretary of the Department on Church and Society of the World Council of Churches.

youth. They have made little study of communism as either an ideology or a political movement and feel unable to answer its claims. Under these conditions their opposition very often takes the form of negative anti-communism rather than an effort to provide an alternative answer to the problems of social change that really responds to the urgent questions of youth.

Christians in the West often feel that the main problem in the areas of rapid social change is the threat of communism, and they tend to measure the loyalty of African, Asian or Latin American Christians by their willingness to participate in the world-wide struggle against it. This uncertainty and even disagreement about the right Christian interpretation of the challenge of communism severely weakens the total Christian witness.

A Fundamental Incompatibility

There is agreement, in principle, among Christians that Christianity and communism are in fundamental opposition because of their conflicting views of man and society. In Christian conferences and church reports it has been stated repeatedly that communism is a scheme of redemption that pretends to have a solution not only to the problems of social organization but also to the ultimate problem of man in all his relationships. It therefore involves total ideological claims that Christians cannot accept. This has been made clear in various ecumenical statements on social questions and was reiterated in the international Christian study conference on rapid social change held in Greece in 1959:

... it [Marxist communism] seeks to control the whole of culture; it fails to understand the deeper dimension of the human person; in becoming a substitute for religion and in teaching an anti-religious dogma, it leaves no place for the recognition of the judgment and mercy of God who transcends all societies. These total ideological claims in communism Christians must reject.

Christians in Communist countries have recognized this fundamental difference between the Christian and Communist view of man and society, even when they have viewed favorably the social achievements of communism. Bishop K. H. Ting of the Episcopal Church in China has written:

In the New China the level of morality has been greatly raised. Does that mean that the question of sin has been solved? Decidedly not. The fact that man must come into a very good environment (New China) before he consciously manifests a better standard of behavior does not at all mean that man is without sin, rather it is a demonstration that man is carrying the heavy burden of sin,

which makes it impossible for him to overcome his environment.

However, while Christians agree on the fundamental spiritual conflict between Christianity and communism, there has been a great divergence of opinion, even within the same church, on how this is to be interpreted and on the proper Christian response to the challenge of communism.

Many Christians agree that the totalitarian political and social character of communism derives from its ideological conception of man and society; this is in conflict with the Christian interpretation not only in theory but in practice, and for that reason the Christian cannot participate in the Communist movement. This has been stated unequivocally in a series of reports published by a group of leading Indian Christians who are keenly concerned about a more effective Christian witness in society. In a study issued in 1953 they declared: "It is our conviction that under no circumstances can a Christian be a Communist. We hold that it is not possible for anyone to remain a Christian and be either a party member or a fellow traveller." A statement of the Eastern Asia Christian Conference of 1949 makes it clear why this is so: "because communism lacks a conception of the independence of moral reality over against power, it denies the supremacy of the moral law over power politics and hence in the long run defeats the very purpose of the social revolution."

These Christians oppose communism also because it distorts the true aim of social and economic change. The basic problem for Christians in relation to all economic development is: shall the nations and peoples sacrifice everything for the sake of greater production? Christians argue that whereas Marxism began with the desire to eliminate a threat to the true dignity and nature of man, it has in fact only raised in a new form the problem of man's alienation by its great emphasis on material achievement. In this respect it repeats the errors of capitalism. That is another reason why it is said, "Betrayal is the key word to describe communism."

This position has been largely reaffirmed in subsequent statements. The Indian report on *Christian Participation in Nation-Building* (1960), edited by P. D. Devanandon and M. M. Thomas, considered the possibility of Christian support for the Communist party in India, noting that it was the strongest of the Opposition parties in the Central Legislature, and concluded:

The question has been raised whether the Communist Party of India might be developed as an effective Opposition. The principle is clear: Parties which will put an end to the due process of law, the fundamental rights

of the human person, and the right of opposition, once they come to power, whether they be of the right or the left, cannot be entrusted with power; and therefore they cannot be considered a democratic Opposition. . . . the party has so far given no evidence of a real break with the totalitarian philosophy or of a really democratic transformation. It is not yet a party with whom our country's future can be trusted.

Experiment in Kerala

In 1957 in the Indian general elections the Communist Party came to power in the state of Kerala, and a consultation of Christian leaders, meeting to examine the Christian responsibility under Communist rule in that situation, once again affirmed the dangers of the Communist doctrine of the State. The meeting concluded that "the negative aspects outweigh the positive and that the Communist rule posed a real threat to parliamentary democracy." It defined its view of the Christian attitude to the Communist government thus:

In as much as the Communists have been returned to power by constitutional means, the Communist government deserves discerning support. Mere anti-communism without any positive approach will not be helpful in the situation. While one cannot forget the inherent dangers of communism, the role of those who believe in democracy is that of responsible opposition. . . . As the Communist party has democratically come to power and formed the Government, it is our duty: (1) to submit to the authority of its Government and cooperate as citizens in its efforts for the protection of freedom, the maintenance of order and the promotion of justice; (2) to oppose the Government through constitutional methods and through the means of democratic parties, whenever the Government infringes on fundamental human rights; (3) to suggest to the Government through proper channels our constructive ways and means of meeting our measures of justice to the people; (4) strengthen the hands of democratic parliamentary parties to act as responsible opposition in the Legislature; (5) work for the eradication of the evils within the democratic parties and help them to secure the majority of votes in the next election.

A second report on the situation in Kerala, issued in 1959 after popular agitation had led to the intervention of the Central Government and the dismissal of the Communist Government, observes that the Communists were rightly deposed because of their anti-democratic spirit and their resort to a deliberate policy of encouraging class violence: "Not only by their tenets, but also by their practice in Kerala, the Communists have shown that they do not work in a truly democratic way."

The report also noted that this experience should help to arouse the indifferent segments of the community to the need for dynamic social change, the lack of which has helped to bring the Communists to power. The danger is that many people will be satisfied with "a negative anti-communism." "The task before us today is the formation of a truly democratic government which would effectively implement a programme of progressive social change." In this and in other reports the Indian Christians declare that the primary Christian responsibility is to do everything possible to strengthen social democracy. This will involve them in a constant struggle with authoritarian and anti-democratic tendencies whether they come from the party in power or the Communist Party.

The Necessity of Change

While recognizing the incompatibility of Christianity and communism, there are many Christians in Africa, Asia and Latin America, especially students and youth, who insist that the Christian response must be modified or at least qualified by certain basic considerations. The statement of these considerations varies between the different areas, but in practically all countries the following points would be included:

(1) Communism is a judgment on the West and upon the lack of social concern in the churches. It has performed an important function in challenging Western imperialism in Africa and Asia, and it has also rightly criticized the Church and the missionary movement for their entanglement with Western cultural, political and economic domination. Its sins must not be stressed so heavily that Christians forget those of Western capitalist society and colonialism. The thinking of the Church has often been too much dominated by Western-style anti-communism. Before the Church can oppose communism, it must engage in radical self-criticism and understand its failure to answer the needs of men struggling for a new social order. The Communist view of national revolutionary change may actually be more in line with popular hopes in Africa and Asia than the Western-style conception of gradual development often held in the Church.

(2) Christians in Africa, Asia and Latin America, especially youth, insist that it is necessary to distinguish between the ideological pretensions of communism and the militant action of social justice that it has produced in Russia and China. The Report of the First Assembly of the East Asia Christian Conference acknowledged that "Many Asians, especially intellectuals and workers, are fascinated and challenged by the quicker pace of

economic development in China under communism. They would like to put economic progress as the first priority even when they are aware of the disregard of human rights involved." Some Christians believe that they can distinguish between the revolutionary principles of change and the ideology of communism. In their view this ideology does not invalidate the revolutionary interpretation of social change that communism has shown to be necessary and possible.

(3) Given the strength of communism in many countries and the weakness or absence of democratic political alternatives, Christians may be confronted with the need to give at least limited support to Communists. In some situations a Communist-backed party or government is the only practical medium of action for Christians who want to express their concern for political order and justice. In the political alignment in many situations, so it is argued, communism is not the greatest evil, and the Christian has no choice but to work with them or to support reactionary political movements. It is also noted that the Communists of Africa, Asia and Latin America are often nationalists first and Communists second, and therefore capable of distinguishing between the national interests of the country and the international interests of Soviet or Chinese power.

These considerations are very real for many young Christians who want to take part in the social revolution of their country. A young Methodist pastor and student leader in Cuba, writing in early 1961 at a time when most Christians in North America regarded the Castro regime as Communist dominated, declared:

The Cuban revolution is the most important event of this century in Latin America. . . . Colonialism is a problem not only in Africa and Asia, but also in Latin America. After a great struggle, our countries freed themselves from the domination of Spain. Now Cuba is leading the way in winning Latin American independence from another type of colonialism: the economic domination and indirect political influence of the US.

Many Protestant church leaders in Cuba who supported the revolutionary movement in its struggle against the Batista regime have now become disillusioned with the Castro government, but at the same time do not want to return to the *status quo ante*.

The Dilemma of All Christians

Without necessarily agreeing with these views, we can understand the difficult struggle of Christians in the areas of rapid social change to preserve their national freedom and social development in the present world ideological and political con-

flict. In relation to the cold war the new nations are involved in a struggle on two fronts: in their view they are seeking to preserve and advance their self-identity in relation to two great ideological powers, with both of which they have only common social and political interests.

In their eyes the Western powers represent the former colonialists and imperialists who would readily reassert their spheres of influence if it were not for the threat of counterintervention by the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union is likewise struggling for power. Although it has the advantage of not having exercised colonial domination and of not having to defend old economic patterns, it would readily subvert governments and societies in order to extend its influence. Yet it is from these two world power centers that most of the economic aid and technical assistance for social development must come. To be solely dependent upon either one of them would be a national catastrophe for the countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America. Their hope is in maintaining a precarious neutrality, thus gaining time for their own development and for greater independence of action.

If either side in the great power struggle gains an advantage or presses conditions for economic assistance too far, national freedom is endangered, and the only possible reaction is to invite help from the other side. To the extent that the West refuses to accept the political and economic neutrality of the uncommitted nations, it helps to push them in the direction of communism. It is one of the ironies of the present situation that, in their zeal to "save" nations in Africa and Asia from communism, the Western nations frequently forget that these countries also want in some measure to be "saved" from the West; the more the West tries to secure their alliance, the more these countries feel obliged to show their independence of it by accepting technical assistance, economic aid and moral support from the Communist countries.

People in the West tend to regard this attitude as the result of exaggerated nationalism and supersensitivity to a Western colonialism that is now dead. In their view the precarious alliance on which effective political and military opposition to communism depends deserves the support of all countries who desire to live in freedom. They find it difficult to understand how nations can be neutral on that essential issue. It is at this point that the peoples of the West must face the contradictions in their own profession to be the "free world" that has no other interest than to defend the cause of freedom for the new nations. The question is whether they can understand the am-

(Continued on page 176)



Saint Hereticus

Snaring the Sophisticates

"How can we interest *intelligent* people in the faith?" more than one church executive has asked on more than one occasion.

Well, I've found a way. It came to me as I was scanning the best-seller lists and noted that a consistent winner has been *Winne Ille Pu*. This translation of an old English classic into Latin—a daring reversal of the more familiar formula of translating an old Latin classic into English—has apparently had numerous benefits for all concerned. For one thing, it is now a mark of social sophistication to have *Winne Ille Pu* sitting on one's coffee table. Furthermore, people have started reading the old English version again, apparently needing a "trot" when the going got hard. The sale of Latin-English dictionaries has undoubtedly been aided. And people otherwise separated by linguistic boundaries have now found a common bond.

Why not, I mused, learn from our brethren in the commercial world and by a similar device recapture the sophisticated intelligentsia for the faith? The gimmick for achieving this came to me in a flash—daring in its simplicity and yet daring in its implications: *a Latin Bible*. I know the conservatives among my readers will object to the practicality, if not the wisdom, of such a venture, but none of the objections, I am convinced, can begin to outweigh the advantages of proceeding immediately to do for Joseph and Amos and Paul what *Winne Ille Pu* has done for Piglet and Eeyore and Tigger. Put it all in Latin, and people will not only leave the translation on their coffee tables, they'll begin to read one of the "trots" still available.

Some, of course, will object that since the Bible is considerably longer than *Winnie the Pooh*, it

would take too long to get the whole thing in good solid Latin. Here the answer is clear: we need a team of translators, each one given responsibility for a single book, meeting about twice a year to check one another's work. In this way we could have a smooth Latin translation in, say, five to seven years.

Others will object to the cost of such a venture. But if the various denominations were to cooperate on the subject, sharing the costs and taking a small investor's gamble (no faith without risk . . .), the losses, even if there were any, could be spread around so as to do no harm to anyone.

The most powerful objection, I feel sure, will come from the Roman hierarchy. I am aware that we have a problem here. Rome moves slowly, preferring to "wait and see" before rushing aboard the latest doctrinal or promotional fad. The notion of a Latin translation of the Bible is perhaps *too* daring for us to anticipate Roman support, at least for a number of decades. But if the venture should prove successful, a time might come—and not in the far distant future only—when the Roman Church, while perhaps not approving of the sale of a Latin version to its laity, would permit its use on the part of seminarians and those who are members of religious orders.

Objections there are bound to be, but think of the advantages. If the movement to read the Bible in Latin caught on, we could gradually introduce readings from the Latin translation into church services, and in time it might be possible to render some of the musical portions of the service in the Latin tongue. From there it would be only a step to the use of congregational responses in Latin, and even the introduction of Latin prayers. The compulsory use of Latin in sermons would lead to a revival of expository preachers, since most preachers would know only enough Latin to shift biblical phrases around and use them as their own. (We must guard against a Latin edition of the *Reader's Digest*.) Finally, this use of a common tongue (the "vernacular," we might one day call it) could be a means of uniting the separated portions of Christendom, since there would no longer be any need to argue about "debts" vs. "trespasses" or whether there *were* any Communists on the R.S.V. translation committee.

As a preparation for these and other consequences, the first step is obviously to start boning up on *Winne Ille Pu* itself.

(Continued from page 174)

biguities and contradictions of their "Western-style freedom" as seen from the standpoint of ex-colonies and peoples who have been living in subservience to the Western economic and political system.

All this poses the need for a spiritual and moral critique of the Western nations in relation to the new nations in which the churches could and should play a large role. It will not involve them, in the first instance, in a critique of communism but in an analysis of the dangers of Western power and the meaning of nationalism in Africa and Asia as a challenge to that power. Western power gains its moral political authority from the assumption that it is exercised in the name of Christian civilization. The churches must ask questions regarding the fundamental character and future of this Western civilization, and in doing so they can demonstrate that they share the dilemmas of the areas of rapid social change.

The Church today has the difficult obligation to maintain its spiritual freedom from political ideologies, while at the same time expressing its concern for social and political justice in a period of great disagreement about the nature of such justice and about the best means of achieving it. It must struggle to show that "it is not the challenge of any ideology but the knowledge of the love of God in Christ for man that is the basis of the Church's social and political concern." The churches have yet to discover ways to make this real. Recent ecumenical meetings have begun to define some universal criteria for a Christian conception of freedom and justice, and these statements have served as a guide to Christians in their day-to-day struggle and social tensions that are constantly pulling it apart. However, there are churches in all countries that have yet to discover the reality of this struggle for the independence of the Church from political systems and goals. Everywhere there is pressure on the Church to take sides in the world power struggle.

DETROIT PUBLIC LIBRARY
PHIL-RELIG & EDUC PER
5201 WOODWARD AVE
DETROIT 2 MICH
48205 S-CID A

The challenge is particularly real today for the churches in Western Europe and the US. At a time when Western power and security is threatened not only by the Communist world, but by the growing strength of the African, Asian and Latin American nations, they face a fundamental spiritual dilemma. Where does their moral responsibility lie: in preserving Western political and economic power as a kind of Christian bastion from which they may hope to influence the direction of political and social development in other countries? or in recognizing that attempts to hold on to Western political power are self-defeating and that the Western world is inevitably in political decline, with the rise to power of the new nations representing as they do the great mass of the world's people? The latter view would lead to the conclusion that the sole means of demonstrating Western Christian concern for the political future of the underdeveloped countries is through a new humility and an intense new development of the West's capacity to share the fruits of the good life with those who struggle for opportunity and self-realization. But this will require a grace of spirit that comes not from man but from God. The challenge to affluent Western society and to the churches that are so much identified with it is clearly one that they cannot meet alone, but only through an encounter with the Church in areas of rapid social change.

CHRISTIANITY and CRISIS

A Christian Journal of Opinion

537 WEST 121 ST. • NEW YORK 27 • N.Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR AND JOHN C. BENNETT, *Chairmen*
WAYNE H. COWAN, *Managing Editor*
WILLIAM C. ADEN, JR., *Assistant Editor*
M. SEARLE BATES WALDO BEACH AMOS WILDER
ROBERT MCAFEE BROWN F. ERNEST JOHNSON
ROGER L. SHINN HENRY P. VAN DUSEN
RICHARD T. BAKER J. OSCAR LEE
TOM F. DRIVER ROBERT W. LYNN
KENNETH W. THOMPSON WILLIAM LEE MILLER

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

HENRY SMITH LEIPER JOHN A. MACKAY
FRANCIS P. MILLER M. M. THOMAS
WILLIAM F. MAY J. B. DUROSSELLE
HERBERT BUTTERFIELD SIDNEY LANIER

CONTENTS

COMMUNISM IN AREAS OF
RAPID SOCIAL CHANGE PAUL R. ABRECHT
SNARING THE SOPHISTICATES ST. HERETICUS